G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File No. 254–12.

1912.

Serial Nos. 1–10.

Later references. (Inwards)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 — 10.

Part B for May. 17.

SUBJECT.

Review-petn. of Devayya of Inigur, T. Narasipur Taluk re the inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneya Swami temple at Inigur.

To, Dy. Comrs. Mysore. No. 2759. Dt. 7-5-17.

I forwards a copy of the order slightly modifying the G.O. under review declaring the petitioner's liability to pay the old cess & the usual cess, viz, 9-4-4 to the temple

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

D. R. Appadurai

G.R.S. 11] 1912.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inungai)

NOTES.

File No. 254-12

FILE HEADING.

Review-petition of Devaiya of Inugur, T. Narasipur Tq, regarding the Inam lands endowed to Sri Anjaneya Swamy Temple at Inugur.

From

Devaiya Son of Eraiya, Inugur,

~~No.~~ Petition Dated 26.9.12 Received 30.9.12

Diary No. 607	Enclos. —	Spare Copies. —	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Prays for a review of the Govt orders conveyed in G.O. No 1759-60 Dj 6-10-05 directing that the khata of the lands should continue to stand in the name of the temple, and that a total sum of Rs 9-6-0 which is one-half

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) If the assessment of the lands be recovered from the petr.

Inug. J. nos. 24 of 1905 and 260 of 1905 are herewith submitted.

2) The facts of the case are contained in

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—30,000—12-811

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Misc File No. 25 of 1912

Serial No.	
	The office-note of 7 no 47 of 1905, and G.O. of 6th oct 1905 referred to
	The petr presented a review-applicn no. 4487 Dy 19 4 06 for a re consideration of the Govt order and this was forwarded for report. From the rets put up, it does not seem that a further report was received from the Dy. Commr and orders of Govt passed thereon—
	Submtd with a Dft. forwarding the petition present in Cantt for report
	DVC(37) 16 11 12
	Issue—
2	41 To The Dy commr Mysore Dist No 652 D 25 11 1912 Forwards the petn for report in cont. of Om no 5050 D 25 06 / Exist to petr through his Advocate no 653 D 25 11 1912
3.	5/- From, The Dy Commr, Mysore Distt Letter no 309 Dy 8-1-1903 Submits records relating to the Review application of Denaiah—
	6 The present Review petition forwarded with Rs

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

G R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 254 of 1912

Serial No.

has not been received

Submits with a Dft calling for it re transmission.

(AVC(13)
17.1.13

4 8) To

The Dy Commr

Mysore Dist

No 856 D 24.1.1913

Requesting that petn regd. no 607 forwarded in this office memo no 652 mem 254-12-2, D 25.11.1912, may be returned.

5. 7) From, the Dy Commr, Mysore Distt

Letter no 339 D 31-1-13
3-2-13.

Re-transmits the Revenue-petition called for in Sl 4.

10) In G.O. no. 1759-60 D 6th Octr 05, orders were passed about the Inam lands endowed to Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple at Hunguru in the T. Narasipur Tq. It was directed that the possession of the lands by the present cultivator Devaiya need not be disturbed, that one-half of the assessment on the said lands viz Rs 9-6-0 has to be remitted from

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

the aliences and that the khata of the lands should however continue to stand in the name of the Temple and a Muchalika obtained from the cultivator Devaiyya recognizing the temple's right to the lands in question In 1906, Devaiyya presented a Review-petition praying for a re-consideration of the said order. Under cover of C. R. No. 5050 Dy 22 May 1906, the petition was forwarded for report together with the enquiry as to why a copy of Govt order of Octr 1905 was given to the petr while the grant of such copies was prohibited in Govt order No. 4082- Pctr 864 Dy 12th Octr 1895. Another review-petition presented by Devaiyya in Septr 1912 was forwarded in Contn to the Dy. Commr, and that officer has submitted his report with records. The grounds urged for review are as noted below:—

1) That Govt having recognized the possession and enjoyment of the lands by Devaiya family from the year 1806, erred in ordering that the Patta should be made

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—65,000—7-6-12.

Serial No.

out in the name of the Temple,
(2) that the order was passed without hearing him,
(3) that the kandayam payable for the said lands as assessed by the Survey Settlement is Rs 6-4-0 and not Rs 9-4-0.

(4) In the Inam Register, the lands are noted as Devadaya, and in G.O. dated 6th Octr 1905, it is said that the Survey assessment on the lands is Rs 9-6-0. The Dy. Commr reports that the facts of the case are given in the Govt order in question, and that the copy of the order was given to the petr through a mistake in 1906 and needful orders have been issued to the Departments to guard against such irregularity in future.

Submitted for orders
AVC(132)
19.2.13

The petitioner traverses the correctness of the facts recited in the Govt order. A note on the petitioner should be put up, from a study of the Inam records.

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—6⁵,000—'7-6-12.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 254 of 1912

Serial No

3) (1) What is the extent and Assessment of the lands

(2) Is this assessment being paid to the Amlak or to the Govt:

(3) Is the khata in the name of the petitioner or the temple

[The review application shows that the Govt: order has not been correctly understood]

Leg 30.6.13

papers refg. to in the

14) The Review-petition of 1912 has been flagged. It contains among other things extracts from Mr C B. Seshagiri Rao's order of 29th March 1902 and the Govt order of October 1905 now sought to be reviewed. The grounds for review are summarized in Sub-paras 1 to 13 of Para 10 of the review-petition.

15) The petr complains that the Govt have erred in ordering that "the patta should now be made out in the name of the Temple" but para 5 of the Govt order says that the khata of the lands should however continue to stand in the name of the Temple.

The petr contends that (Para 4 of the) Govt order wrongly fixes the kandaya

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—65,000—'7-6-12.

Serial No.

on the lands at Rs 9-6-0 though the Survey assessment on the lands is Rs 6-4-0. The order says as follows:

"...One-half of the assessment on the "said lands has to be received "from the alienee in accordance with "those (Alienation) Rules and paid "to the Temple. This amounts to Rs 9-6-0

This portion of the order does not seem to be quite clear the Survey assessment on the lands is Rs 6-4-0, and the amount fixed is one and half times the Survey assessment. From the statement of Deviah's father Veerah on 4th Janv. 1898, it is clear that the temple was getting Rs 9-4-4 excluding the water rate etc. Viz Rs 3-11-7, and the petr. has been directed to pay the difference viz Rs 0-1-8 in addition.

(5) Query no i – The extent and the assessment of the lands are noted below:–

S. nos.	extent	assessment.
	A. G	Rs. A. P
825 —	2 – 2 —	2 – 4 – 0
832 —	3 – 8	4 – 0 – 0
	5 – 10	Rs 6 – 4 – 0

(6) Query no ii – It is not known whether the assessment is being paid to the Archak or to the Trust since orders were issued in 1905.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—85,000—17-6-12.

[R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 254 of 1912

Serial No.	
	query No 3 — In his 1st review-petition of 1906, Deviah complains that the khata of the S. Nos stood in the name of his forefathers and that after his father's death, the khata thereof, instead of being transferred to the petrs. name, has been wrongly made out in the name of the temple In his 2d Review-petition of 1912, he states that the patta of the lands stands in his name. (2) A draft calling for specific information on queries Nos. 2 & 3 is put up.
	Submitted [signature]
	MC(115) 20-10-1913. (2) [signature] 21 10 13
6	To The Dy. Commr Mysore Dt (2) No 1290 Dt 6.11.13 Calls for certain information with regard to the lands in question.
[illegible]	From, The Dy Commr, Mysore Distt (3) Letter No 403 Dt 3-2-1916
	Submits further report called for in Serial 6.
	(25) It is reported that the assessment on the temple lands has not been paid either to the Archak or to Govt. from the date of settlement,

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 254 of 1912

Serial No.

but the Archak himself is paying to Govt a local cess of Rs 6-3 annually, and that the khata of the lands is in the name of Anjaneya Swami.

Submitted for orders with ref to U Seqs NW 1949 31.3.1916 queries at page 7 of the notes. (The petitioner complains that the review he was not given a hearing).

ann 1/4/16

24) Is the Archak receiving the manual payment by Devadaik. Consult records papers

Ls 4/4

25) In his report no 46 Dt 12th August 1914, The Sanbag of Mysore States that the assessment on the lands is not being paid to the Archak from the date of Settlement.

Submitted with a Dft as directed

ann NW 1944 15.4.16 19.4.16

26) Dft

Ls 15.4.16

8 calling for ~~Endorsement~~ further information about the inam lands endowed to Devadaik

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 191

Serial No.

to Mugur Anjaneya Temple & enquiring whether the rent of Rs 9-6-0 is being paid annually

Do. D. C. Mysore no 2559 Dt 26-4-16.

9. From, the Dy. Commr, Mysore Dist. Letter no 67 Dt 12 [illegible] 1917

Furnishes further information called for in Sl 8.

29 The Dy Commr reports that the rent of Rs 9-6-0 on the old rent of Rs 9-4-4 is not being paid to the Archak annually, that the Archak did not prefer any complaint as he had been trying to get back the inam lands, and that the puja is being conducted out of the monthly grant of Rs 0-13-7 supplemented by his private funds.

2nd) The Sub Divl Officer suggests that the lands may be taken under Govt management, as the cultivator denies adhepas, failed to pay the Kattige from 1905 either to the Archak or to the Taluk Office.

Submitted for orders

NV (94) 17-1-1917

The S D-D

17/1/17

after the issue of the usual notice

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—6,000—17-6-12.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 254 of 1912

Serial No.

31) The petitioner Devaraja appears to have presented a revised petition in 1906 which was sent to the Dy. Comr. for report. No further action was taken thereon. He has again submitted another petition in Sept. 1912 and it is this application that is now under disposal.

32) The first after application was within time and as the second one is practically only a reminder, the question may be considered on its merits and a final order passed once for all.

33) On the merits, it seems to me, I say so in all deference, that the order of 6th Oct. 1905 was not quite correct. There was really no alienation but only the cultivation of the lands was left with Devaraja's family for a long time past as is evident from the fact that a payment of Rs. 9.4.4 to the Ambalakara of this ancestors is admitted. This by itself gives him no right to continue in possession. A number of similar cases have also been decided in which the Govt. have refused to recognize the lessee's or tenants' right to continue

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

in possession. There are a number of such cases now under the consideration of Govt. and it would be satisfactory if an uniform policy is followed with respect to such long standing holding by a tenant.

34) In the present case it seems to be contended that the lands are devadaya inam and that payments were being made to the archaks until the present dispute arose, the amounts so paid being in lieu of the Beriz which was known as 3 P or Rs 8-11-8 which with the local cess of Rs. 8 p. viz. ~~[illegible]~~ explain the payment of Rs 8-4-4 by Devasthanam Committee. It is thus pended that only the Beriz was made over to the Temple the occupancy right being left in tenant. In

can derive title the right. Tenant subject to payment after Beriz

35) The petitioners pray for a remission which may be given and the opportunity may be taken to collect the arrears due on pain after holding being forfeited.

(No enclosures)

26.1.17

15-7-17
25.

36) The case may be forwarded for orders

2-2-17

2/2

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 254 of 191 .

Serial No.

37) Submtd. with D/Sh. notices to the 3rd March 17
N(Gen) 7.2.17 amn 8/2/17 appd hm 9-2-17

38)
Appl.-manual. Notice was given to the Respdt also. But as I have discussed the case unfavourably to the appl., while I was of opinion that it is perhaps desirable that I should not have the case again brought in review. We file may be submitted to the Secretary for orders
Leave
3/3/17

5071 6.3.17 40) Subd to Secretary
hm
3-3-17

I shall be obliged if the Secretary will kindly deal with this appeal.
17-3-17. Ho

82 19.3.17 Subd to Hon'ble member
hm
17.3.17

Post hearing This is a to your Hon'ble
Case
Amn 20/3
hm 20/3/17

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 254 of 191 2

Serial No.

Head Works 13-4-17

There is no doubt that the Gat[illegible] of the Complaint apptt is substantially correct. The appellts. being an old tenant having succeeded to both his tenants interest [illegible] under the will contains his interest subject to certain charges in favour of the temple on the land as it stands. Inam Deeds had [illegible] which the will to contain the register land in the name of the temple committee should be entered

As regards the amount payable the apptt must be liable for the assessment and there is the Inam Settlr. & as there is no alteration mentioned here 4 y 40 — rate under this is modified - the pet being declared only liable for 1/3 of the old Jeeny + Cesses = Rs 4-4-4 to the temple

20.4

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S. 16

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 254 of 1912

Serial No.

Submit. with a D/R order for approval
AV (94)
30.4.1917

1/5/17

approved
2/5/17

10

Depy Secy Revenue for Hon'ble Member in charge
No: 2759 dt 7.5.17, Revenue Secy
in the case slightly modifying the
G.O. under review declaring the
Rulers' liability to be the old basis
& the measures viz in G.O. 4-6-6 in the
Temple.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.



To

The Muzarai Secretary Superintendent

~~The Govt~~ Mysore Govt Secretary

Bangalore

Miss. Petition No. of 1912/13

Miss. Muzarai No. 1 of 1901/02 on the file of the

1st General Assistant Commr's Mysore District

Petitioner	Counter Petitioner
Srinivasachar	Devaraja
Poojari of Anjanaya	son of Eraya
Devara of Moogoor	residing at Moogoor
Varasapura Taluk	Narasapura Taluk
Mysore District	

The Counter Petitioner Devaraja above named, most respectfully begs to state as follows:—

That the Counter Petitioner Devaraja deceased father Eraya, his ancestors, and after their death, the Counter Petitioner have been enjoying the lands bearing

Survey

Survey Nos 825 & 832 situated at Moogoor Cavalea — & Moogoo'r Hobli, Turumakundal & Narasapur Taluk in their own right for upwards of one hundred years ——

2) That the said lands have been under the Survey Settlement assessed as Survey, No. 825 @ 2 14/" 832 @ 4 /" /" Total 6 — 4 —

3 That the Patta of these lands stands in the name of the Counder-petitioner Devanja the same having been transferred to his name after his father Cranjas death ——

4. That the Patta of the said lands stood in the name of Counder-petitioners great great-grandfather in 1834-35 (Vide Ex

5 That the Petitioner Turumalachare in No — brought to previous possession of the said Survey Nos 825 & 832 alleging that the said lands are Inam lands belonging to the Temple ——————

6. That the Counder-petitioner pleaded that the said allegations made by the

2 and that

the said lands bearing Survey Nos 825 & 832, are his ancestral properties and that his ancestors and he have been in possession and enjoyment on their own right uninterruptedly for upwards of one hundred years.

That the said Fiscal-General Assistant Commissioner engrossed into the said case and after a careful consideration of the evidence passed his judgment to the following effect:—viz:—

(1) That there is no proof to show that either the Petitioner or his ancestors had ever in possession of the said lands

(2) That it is proved beyond doubt that the County Petitioner and his ancestors have been in uninterrupted possession of these lands from 1806-07

(3) That the Ex. 1 shews that the Patta of these lands stood in the name of the Counter-petitioner's (Devaya) great, great-grandfather

(4) That the Exhibits 10 to 70 shew that the Petitioner Devaya has been paying Kandoryam of the said lands to Sirkar-Govt, and that the Petitioner

Read

has been recovering the same from the Government

5. That for these reasons the Petitioner Sivanmalachari is not entitled to recover possession of the said lands and that the suit is dismissed.

8 That the Petitioner Sivanmalachari subsequently appears to have given a petition to the Deputy Commissioner who without giving any notice of the same to the Counter-petitioner Devaya and without considering the judgment passed after due enquiry and careful consideration by the Ld. General Assistant Commissioner then in charge of the Muzarai Department, recommended to the Government that the Counter petitioner Devaya should be dispossed of the said lands & that they may be given to other persons for cultivation.

9. That thereupon the Muzarai Secretary without giving any notice to the Counter-petitioner passed an Ex-parte order as follows viz:-

(a) That it appears from the

records forwarded by the Deputy Commissioner that what Devaya (Counter-Petitioner) states is true

(b) That the said Devaya has produced several documents in original to show that the said lands have been in uninterrupted possession and enjoyment of him (Devayas) family since 1806-07

(c) That besides these that after examining the records, it appears that the archaka (Petitioner) had filed a suit for the same relief in the Assistant Commissioners Court, then in charge of Muzarai Department, who after examining all the old records carefully and after careful consideration, decided that the Petitioner has no right to recover possession of the said lands from the Counter petitioner Devaya

(d) That for these reasons the Government have decided that the present enjoyer (Counter-petitioner), of the said lands, should not be dispossessed

of the said lands.

(E) That the Petitioner is entitled to one half of the Kandayam of the said lands from the Pagavalidar and that the said Kandayam amounts to Rs. 9/61.

(F) That it seems that the Pagavalidar has been paying 9-4-4 exclusive of water pass payable to Govt: to Arachchi

(G) That the Patta of the said lands should be in the name of the Sample and that a moochilika from the present Pagavalidar Devarge, should be taken

That the Counter petitioner after hearing the said Ex parte order, applied to the Government on the 19th April 1906 (Petition No. 4487) to reverse the said Ex parte order on the following among other grounds viz:—

1 That the Government upholding the judgment of the General Assistant Commissioner then in charge of the Mudaraic Department that the Counter petitioner and

his ancestors have been in ununderrupted possession and enjoyment of the said lands from the year 1806 and that the patta of the said lands stand in the name of the Counter petitioner's family, erred in ordering that the patta should now be made out in the name of the Temple

10 That the order was without any notice to the Counter petitioner, passed against him and is not binding upon him

11 That the Kandayam payable for the said lands as assessed by the Survey Settlement is Rs. 6/4/- and not Rs 9-4-

11 That the Counter petitioner most humbly begs to submit that the Counter petitioner is not a Saguvaledar, he cultivates & enjoys the lands paying Sirkar Kandayam for his own right.

12- That there is no reason whatever to the Patta standing in the name of Counter petitioner's family for upwards

of one hundred years, being transferred in the name of the Temple ———

13 That the full amount or any portion of the Kaudayam due by him to Government may be paid to Archaka as prayed ———

14 That the Counter-Petitioner humbly begs that proper justice may be done and that he may be protected ———

Please serve as follows

To Devaya son of Devaya
of Mogaer
Hobli Arasikere Taluq
thro J. D. Subbarayya Advocate
Advocate
City Court

I Rly. No 652 Ex. 1. Dy 25/11/1912
Dis 254-12-2

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No..... ....

The accompanying Petition Registered No. 607 dated 26.9.12 received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Devaiya of Hunsur, T. Narasipur Dq, praying for a re-consideration of the orders passed by Govt re the inam lands endowed to Sri Anjaneyaswamy Temple at the place,

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures,~~ to the Dy. Comr, Mysore Dis, in Contn of this Office No. 5050 Dy 2.5.06 for report.

By Order

For Secy. 19.11.12 Secretary

BANGALORE, 18/11/12

.....191

P. T. O.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.....ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

....ಹೋಬಳಿ

....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ ಹುಕುಂ.

.....

....

.....

....

....

.....

.....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ.... .....

ಮೆರ್ಕುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು..... .....ಬಗ್ಗೆ

.....

.....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

Secretary.

With ref. to his petition

N° 653 Dy 25—11—1912—regd no 607 Dy 26th Sept.
1912

I ~~presented on behalf of Devaraj~~ of Nuggur praying for a re-consideration of the orders passed by Govt regarding the inam lands endowed to Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple at Nuggur, Mr. J. D Subaraya Mudaliar, Advocate, is informed that the petition has been forwarded for report to the Dy Commr, Mysore Dist.

Devarajya son of Veeraya of Nuggur Holenarsipur Tq

By order

Sd/-
Asst Sec. to Govt.
18/11/12

From
The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Division

To The Secy. to the Govt.
Revenue Branch

DIARY No.....

19/12/13
STATION Bangalore
FILE NO. 25472
SERIAL No. 3

Dated 8-1-1913

Despatched 10-1-1913

Received

General No 326
No.

Enclosure No

Submits records relating to the application of Devayya of Anegere

office, Mysore District.

Dated Mysore 8/10 January 1913.

No. 309
1 file

From.

K. Chandy Esqr., B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

To.

K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar Esqr., M.A.,

Offg: Secy. to the Govt. of

Mysore,

General and Rev: Depts.

Annexe Branch.

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No. 5050 of the 2nd May 1906 and subsequent No 652 dated Annx 254-12-2 25-11-1912 calling for a report on the petition of Deviya of Anjur Narsipur Taluk, praying for a iteration of the orders passed

passed by Government regarding the inam lands endowed to Sri Anjaneyaswami temple at the place and enquiring as to why a copy of Government order, referred to were given to the petitioner inspite of Govt. order no: 4082 - Pet. 864 dated 12-10-1895 the I have the honor to submit herewith the file of papers ending with T. Narsipur Taluk Amildar's report no: 202 of the 13th Feb 1907 received through the Sub Division officer Nanjangud and to state that the facts of the case are given in the Government order

The copy of the Government orders was given to the petitioner through a mistake in 1906 And needful orders have been issued to the Departments to guard against such irregularity in future.

The petition with enclosure, received with the official memorandum under reply herewith retransmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Asst: Commissioner
for Deputy Commissioner,
King Emperor Dishich.

Cabsent from Hd: Quarters

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy Commr,
Mysore, &c.

Dated

Despatched 24-1-1913

Received

General No. 856

Inam No. 252-12

Enclosure No.

Adverting to his letter no. 309 Dy 8th Jany 1913 submitting the records relating to the Review-petition of Devaiya of Hunsur about the Inam lands of the temple of Sri Anjaneya Swamy at Hunsur, has the honor to request that petition regd no. D. 604. forwarded with the

No. 652
Mun 256-12-2 dt 25th Nov. 1912

may kindly be returned
with the records rec'd with
the letter under reply
are herewith returned for
ref. and re-turn

By order

DOT

for Hq. Secretary
RG
17.1.13

VII

From 5/2 of 1913

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

DIARY No. 1301

10/2-13/3
PETITION
FILE No. 254-12
SERIAL No. 5

To The Secy to the Govt.
Revenue Branch

Dated 31-1-1913.
Despatched 3-2-1913
Received
General No. 339
No.
Enclosure No. 1 [illegible]

Submits records
re. relating to Review
petitions of Moogoor
Deviah

From
K Chandy Esqr B.A
Deputy Commissioner
[illegible] District

To
R.R. Sreenivasangar Esq B.A
Offg Secretary to the Government of [illegible],
Genl Rev Dept
(Muzarai Division)

Sir,

With reference to your official letter No 657/Muzl 7 254-12-[illegible] dated 25.11.913 [illegible] petition from [illegible] regarding [illegible] of the [illegible] lands endowed to Sri [illegible] temple [illegible], I have the honour to [illegible] this office letter No 309 of the 8 January 9[illegible], with [illegible] the records have been submitted [illegible] No 5050 dated 2.5.1906 on the [illegible].

The petition received with [illegible] reply, as also the records on the subject received with your docket No 856/Muzl 254-12-a dated 26.1.1913 are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
K Chandy
Deputy Commissioner
[illegible]

G.R S 294]

190 .

From

Secy to the Govt of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl and Rev Dept

To

The D C, Mysore Distt

Dated 6-11-1913

Despatched

Received

General No. 1290
Mun No. 254

Enclosure No

Adverting to correspondence
ending with his letter no 339 :
Dy 31st January 1913 reporting
on the review-petition of Venkata
of Nuguv, T. narasipur Sy. Taluq
praying for a re-consideration
of Govt order no 1759-60 Dy
6th Octr 1905 regarding the
inam lands endowed to
Sri Anjaneya Swamy Temple
at the place, has the honor
to request to be furnished
with inform on the points
noted below. —

(1) Is the assessment on

MGCPT—20,000—16 2 05

3 to the Archak, being paid direct, or to the Govt.

(2) Is the khata of the lands in the name of the petr. or the Temple

2) The Vom records are herewith returned for refs. and re-entry

By order
31.10.13
for Secretary.
4/10/13

GPB—50,000—80 7 15

From The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore district.

To The Revenue Secretary
Inspection Branch
Bangalore.

DIARY No. 12-5
12-19
SECTION I
Letter No. 254-12
File No. 1

Dated 3rd January - 1911

Despatched

Received

General No. 1.

No.

Enclosure No.

Furnishing further information called for regarding the waste lands granted to the Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple at Mosfor 7-Nanjangud Taluq

ce of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Dated Mysore 3rd February 1916.

From

A. Subramanya Iyer, Esq. B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

V. R. Thyagaraja Iyer, Esq. M.A.,
Rev. Secretary to the Government of
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Muzrai Branch.

Sir,

With reference to your docket no: 1290/254-12-6 dated 6th November 1913 and subsequent reminder thereto calling for information re the Inam lands endowed to the Sri Anjaneya Swami temple at Mugur, I have the honor to state that the Amildar of T. Narasipur in his ittille no: 3/5- dated 13th August 1914 reports that the assessment on these lands has not been paid either to the archak or to the Government from the date of Settlement, but the archak himself is paying to Govern-

0-6-3 annually and that

the Vakalu is in the name of Sri Anjaneyaswami

Correspondence ending with Nanjangud Sub Division officer's yadi no: 43/180 dated 16th August 1914 are herewith submitted for reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore district.

[illegible] in for re about the inam lands endowed by Rajas Nyanaya Swami temple

File No. 152

Serial No. 8:12

S.R.S. 26]

Diary No. of letter replied to 1325

No. 2559 Cantle.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *19*

To

The Dy. Commissioner,
Mysore District

26. 4. 1916.

Signed by Srinivasa Iyer.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no. 403 Dy 4th Feby 1916 furnishing further information on the review-petition of Devaiya s- Rajas in the T. Narasipur Taluk praying for a re consideration of Govt order no. 1759-60 dated 6th October 1905 relating to the inam lands endowed by

over.

SUBJECT.

Sri Anjaneya Swami temple
at the place, I am directed
to enquire whether as indicated
in para 4 of the order reffd. to,
a rent of Rs 9-6-0 is being
~~recovered~~ paid by the petitioner
cultivator annually to the Archak
~~and paid to the Archak for the benefit of~~
~~the institution~~. And if not, why
the order of Court has not
been carried into effect till
now.

and why is no pooja
is being made no
complaint has been
received from
Archak and how
the pooja is being
conducted

2) The records are herewith
returned for ref. and
re-submission.

I have etc.

19.4.16

for Asst Secy Dr Rao - Secretary

19/4/16

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

GPB—10,000—28 2 11



From

15 JAN 1917

To

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

No. 67 Jagir & Inam
Vol 2 C.

Dated 12th January 1917.

From

K. Mathias, Esquire, B.A.
Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

To,

Dr. K. Narasinga Rao, Esqre, L.M.P.
Secretary to the Govt of H.H. the
Maharaja of Mysore
General Department
Nagamangala

Sir

With reference to your No 2605, Inm 254-12 8 dated 26th April 1916 calling for further information re the Inam land endowed to Sri Anjaneya Swami temple at Mugur in the Narasipur Taluk, I have the honor to state as from Jagir No 602 dated 10th December 1916 received from the Nanjangud Subdy Office, that it was seen that the rent of Rs 9-4-0 of the Inam of 4-4 is not paid to the Archak annually, that the Archak had been trying to get back the Inam lands from the cultivator Devirappa, but did not prefer any complaint in the matter and that the puja is being conducted out of the monthly Cash grant of 0-13-7 supplemented by his private funds.

The records received with the above are herewith submitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servant

M. Seshadri

Dy. Asst Commr
Dy Commissioner
Mysore Dist
Acct from the Gr.

Before the Government of His Highness the

Maharaja of Mysore.

GE... REV... 2 TYPIN... 2 MAY 1917

Appeal No. 13 of 1916-17.

Petr
~~Appellant.~~ Vs. Co-petr
~~Respondent~~

Devaiya of Mugur,
T. Narasipur Taluk. Archak Srinivasachar
of Mugur.

Subject.

Review petition for re-consideration of the order of Govt conveyed in Pro. no. 1759-60 dated 6th October 1905 directing that the khata of inam S. nos. 825 and 832 should continue to stand in the name of Sri Anjaneya Swami Temple at Mugur, and that a ~~Total~~ Sum of ~~Rs~~ 9-6-0 be recovered from the petr and paid to the Archak.

Order

The parties were heard before Govt on the 13th April 1914.

There is no doubt that the Govt order dated 6th October 1905

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

correct. The appellant being an old tenant and having succeeded to his tenants' interests from his ancestors, The order confirms his interests in that behalf subject of course to the right of the temple over the land as its Devadaya inam, and therefore the order directing that the land should continue to be registered in the name of the Temple cannot be disturbed.

As regards the amount payable, the appellant must be liable for the pre-settlement amount shown in the Inam Settlement register, and as there is no alienation involved, para 4 of Govt. order no. 1759-60 Dy 6th octr 1905 now under review is modified, the petitioner being declared liable only to pay the old peiz + the usual cess Rs 9-4-4 to the Temple.

No 2759 Confl Dy 7.5.917

Jans 2524-12-10

G. R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

Copy to the Dy. Commr Mysore Dist No, with the record received with his letter no. 67 Dy 12th Jany 1917.

B. O.

Subject. The order may be passed.

NW 30.xii.17

Sd/- Muznai Secretary

21.5.17

DR

1/5/17

Written Statement produced by the apt. Dyaniah before the 1st member of Council on 3rd March 1917

Lib

[illegible]

1916-17 [illegible]

[illegible] 13 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 120-130 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 8-9 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ತಾ 3-3-1917